

**NO. 12-15-00312-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

**TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT**

**TYLER, TEXAS**

*JOSE CASTANEDA,*  
*APPELLANT*

§ *APPEAL FROM THE 241ST*

*V.*

§ *JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT*

*THE STATE OF TEXAS,*  
*APPELLEE*

§ *SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS*

---

---

***MEMORANDUM OPINION***  
***PER CURIAM***

Jose Castaneda appeals his conviction for aggravated sexual assault of a child. Appellant's counsel filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967), and *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). We affirm.

**BACKGROUND**

Appellant was charged by indictment with the offense of aggravated sexual assault of a child, a first degree felony. The indictment also included two felony enhancement paragraphs. Appellant entered an "open" plea of guilty to the offense charged in the indictment. Appellant and his counsel signed various documents in connection with his guilty plea, including a stipulation in which Appellant swore, and judicially confessed, that the facts alleged in the indictment were true and correct, and constituted the evidence in the case. However, during Appellant's plea hearing, the State abandoned the two felony enhancement paragraphs. The trial court accepted Appellant's plea, adjudged Appellant guilty of aggravated sexual assault of a child, and assessed his punishment at life imprisonment. This appeal followed.

ANALYSIS PURSUANT TO *ANDERS V. CALIFORNIA*

Appellant’s counsel filed a brief in compliance with *Anders* and *Gainous*, stating that he has diligently reviewed the appellate record and is of the opinion that the record reflects no reversible error and that there is no error upon which an appeal can be predicated. From our review of counsel’s brief, it is apparent that counsel is well acquainted with the facts in this case. In compliance with *Anders*, *Gainous*, and *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978), counsel’s brief presents a chronological summation of the procedural history of the case, and further states that counsel is unable to raise any arguable issues for appeal. We have reviewed the record for reversible error and have found none.<sup>1</sup> See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

CONCLUSION

As required, Appellant’s counsel has moved for leave to withdraw in the case. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding); *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We agree with Appellant’s counsel that the appeal is wholly frivolous. Accordingly, we *grant* counsel’s motion for leave to withdraw, and *affirm* the trial court’s judgment. See TEX. R. APP. P. 43.2.

Counsel has a duty to, within five days of the date of this opinion, send a copy of the opinion and judgment to Appellant and advise him of his right to file a petition for discretionary review. See TEX. R. APP. P. 48.4; *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 411 n.35. Should Appellant wish to seek further review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, he must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review or he must file a pro se petition for discretionary review. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed within thirty days from the date of either this opinion or the day the last timely motion for rehearing was overruled by this court. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2(a). Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3. Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the

---

<sup>1</sup> Counsel for Appellant certified that he provided Appellant with a copy of his brief and informed Appellant that he had the right to file his own brief. Appellant was given time to file his own brief, but the time for filing such a brief has expired and we have received no pro se brief.

requirements of Rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.4;  
*In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22.

Opinion delivered June 30, 2016.

*Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Hoyle, J., and Neeley, J.*

(DO NOT PUBLISH)



## COURT OF APPEALS

### TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

#### JUDGMENT

JUNE 30, 2016

NO. 12-15-00312-CR

**JOSE CASTANEDA,**  
Appellant  
V.  
**THE STATE OF TEXAS,**  
Appellee

---

Appeal from the 241st District Court  
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 241-0734-15)

---

THIS CAUSE came to be heard on the appellate record and brief filed herein, and the same being considered, it is the opinion of this court that there was no error in the judgment.

It is therefore ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the judgment of the court below **be in all things affirmed**, and that this decision be certified to the court below for observance.

By *per curiam* opinion.  
*Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Hoyle, J. and Neeley, J.*